

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

Claims 1-27 are pending and under consideration.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

*Claims 1-3, 17-18, 21-22 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima et al. (U.S. Patent 5,659,791) in view of Khoyi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,421,015), Frank et al. (U.S. Patent 5,651,107) and Wan (U.S. Patent 5,530,795).*

As a preliminary matter, it is noted that Wan was not listed in the PTO Form 892 attached to the Office Action. It is respectfully submitted that this reference be listed.

Using independent claim 1 as an example, this claim recites “when the position or the size of said window changes, said transparent window will automatically be changed to have the same position and size as that of said window.”

Wan states in claim 1, “positioning the transparent display window over at least a part of the common display, the common display remaining visible.” Moreover, column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 8, of this reference state that “when the transparency mode has been activated, the transparency application then takes a snapshot image of the common application. The content of the snapshot is then copied into the transparent window. The transparent window is then moved and resized preferably automatically to cover the common application window exactly.” However, there is no description that the transparent window moves according to a change in the position or size of the common application window. Hence, Wan does not disclose that the transparent window is automatically moved in accordance with the change in the position of the underlying application, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s combination is not proper.

Frank teaches varying the degree of transparency of overlapping windows, but does not teach that these windows have the same size and position. This reference would not have benefited from having same position and size of the windows. In fact, same position and size would have resulted in deteriorated legibility of the images. Thus, there would have been no motivation to combine the references as suggested by the Examiner.

By stacking multiple windows in the same exact position/size, it would have been difficult

to distinguish text of one window from that of the other windows. This problem occurs notwithstanding the different transparencies. Although Frank does not explicitly describe this problem, it can be seen from FIG. 7 of this reference that it is difficult to distinguish between the text of different windows when this text overlaps due to close proximity of the windows to each other.

Furthermore, it is noted that FIGS. 8-10 of this reference illustrate that when the overlapping of the windows is minimized the features of the different windows are more easily distinguished. Thus, this reference appears to teach away from the windows having the same size/position. Same size/position would appear to increase the difficulty in distinguishing the features of overlapping windows.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

*Claims 4-12, 16, 19-20 and 23-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Khoyi, Frank and Wan as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Person (Using Windows 3.1).*

As previously argued, the information cut out onto the transparent window is provided with an attribute other than being selected. Referring to claim 1, this is recited as “the attribute information being concerned with showing the information object and including object ID, object type, information type, priority for showing, time stamp, object ID of link-destination object and object ID of a next object which are able to be modified after being created as an information object.”

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Nakajima does not teach priority for showing of objects, time stamp and object link as attributes. Instead, the Examiner relies upon Khoyi. However, the Examiner’s analysis of this reference on page 4 of the Office Action does not discuss priority and time stamp.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

*Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakajima in view of Khoyi, Frank and Person as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Microsoft (Microsoft Windows User’s Guide).*

The above comments also apply here.

**CONCLUSION**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 1-27-04

By:   
Michael J. Badagliacca  
Registration No. 39,099

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501